

REMARKS

In the outstanding office action, claims 1-7 have been rejected in the light of the prior art. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the remarks submitted herewith. As will be discussed in detail below, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Bolsworth et al. (US 5,393,116).

The applicant respectfully submits that Bolsworth et al. fails to disclose each and every element of the pending claims, and therefore fails to anticipate the pending claims.

Bolsworth et al. has been already cited in the introductory part of the specification of the present application (see page 1 line 31 to page 2 line 24).

As indicated in the introductory part of the present application Bolsworth et al. describes a vehicle seat having a back that can be folded down forwards and a locking mechanism interposed between the seat proper and the back of said seat. The locking mechanism (figures 2 and 3) comprises a control piece (70) having an S-shaped guide slot (76), said control piece (70) being pivotally mounted on the rigid plate (32) which connects the back to the seat proper. That complex locking mechanism also comprises a cam plate (50) interposed between the control piece (70) and the rigid plate (32), said cam plate (50) also being provided with an S-shaped guide slot (56) which substantially overlies the S-shaped guide slot (76) of the control piece (70).

A guide peg (68) secured to the back (8) is also received in the respective guide slots (76, 56) of the control piece (70) and of the cam plate (50).

The locking mechanism described in Bolsworth et al is adapted so that the guide slot (76) of the control piece (70) locks the peg (68) when the back is in its raised position, while the detent (90) of the guide slot (56) of the cam plate (50) locks the same peg (68) when the back is in it folded-down position.

That complex locking mechanism thus requires the control piece (70) to be positioned very accurately relative to the cam plate (50) in order to enable the back to be locked in its raised or lowered position, thereby complicating assembly of said locking mechanism on the vehicle seat.

In addition, the presence of two guide slots (76,56) cause the peg (68) which is secured to the back to become jammed when the back is in an intermediate position between its raised and lowered positions.

Consequently, Bolsworth et al. does not disclose a vehicle seat comprising a control mechanism including a control piece with an S-shaped guide slot adapted to receive and lock a peg when the folding portion of the back is either in a raised position or in a folded-down position according to pending claim 1. Bolsworth et al. fails to disclose all the elements of pending claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Bolsworth et al. in view of JP- 5934940. This rejection is traversed.


Bolsworth et al. discloses a very complex adjustment and locking mechanism. As noted regarding the anticipation rejection, there is no suggestion of the simple locking and control mechanism of the present invention. JP-5934940 does not remove this inherent deficiency and it would not have been obvious to combine the very different Bolsworth et al. and the JP-5934940 mechanisms. According by this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Robinson and Krasinski references are noted, but no claims have been rejected in view of either of these references.

In light of the foregoing, the prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, he is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank

By: 
J. William Frank, III
Reg. No.: 25,626

February 6, 2003

200 W Adams
Suite 2150
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 263-4700

Customer No.: 29471